

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HPAC)  
OF  
ARIZONA STATE PARKS  
MEETING OF August 18, 2008  
Peoria City Council Chambers  
8401 W. Monroe St.  
Peoria, AZ**

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Thorne called the meeting to order at 10:10am. Ms. Shulman called the roll and noted that there was a quorum.

Committee Members Present:	Winston Thorne, Chair Tess Nesser Joe Nucci Bonnie Bariola Tami Ryall ( <i>arrived at 10:20</i> ) Charles Ebner Vic Linoff
----------------------------	--

Committee Members Absent:	None
---------------------------	------

Arizona State Parks Staff Present:	Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Grants Vivia Strang, Historic Preservation Grants Consultant Bill Collins, SHPO Ruth Shulman, Advisory Group Coordinator
------------------------------------	---

Guests:	Patrice Caldwell, AZ Department of Health Services Chris Ibarra, AZ State Hospital Philip Blair, Van Buren Civic Association Byron Sampson, City of Phoenix Historic Commission Catherine Foley, Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission Chris Ewell, City of Phoenix Barbara Stocklin, City of Phoenix Paula Moloff, City of Glendale
---------	---

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Members and Staff introduced themselves.

### C. ACTION ITEMS

#### 1. Approval of the June 16, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Bariola moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

#### 2. Presentation Of Grant Applications

Ms. Strang spoke about the current group of applications. For the FY2008 first cycle, 14 applications were received. Two of those were considered ineligible by the rating team, the Santa Cruz Catholic Church for a prior grant application for the roof trusses and the Old Safford Theater for an incomplete grant application. Arizona State University withdrew both of their applications. The remaining ten applications were reviewed and scored. Six applications are recommended for funding; those will be presented in score order from highest score down.

1. City of Glendale – Morcombe Property. This application received 100 points. The grant request is for \$80,672, which is also the Staff recommendation. All scope items are eligible. Ms. Strang asked HPAC to keep in mind that while all scope items are eligible, the next step is for SHPO to review the plans and specifications to ensure they meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. This step is not taken until the grant is awarded.
2. Arizona Museum of Natural History – Mesa Grande Ruins Interpretive Project. This application scored 94 points. The grant request is for \$100,000, which is also the Staff recommendation. Mr. Linoff asked about the score under the Administrative Compliance section of the application; the Museum did not score well for two reasons. Ms. Strang said that the Administrative Compliance is based upon the performance of the City of Mesa as grantee. The issues with Mesa were due to a different project. Mr. Nucci asked if there were a statute of limitations, of sorts, for applicants. Ms. Strang said that the limit is three years for consideration of active grant projects.
3. City of Glendale – First United Methodist Church of Glendale. The application scored 93 points. The grant request is \$45,660, which is also the Staff recommendation.
4. Pinal County – 1891 Second Courthouse. The application scored 91 points. The grant request is for \$150,000, which is also the Staff recommendation. Chair Thorne asked about the scope items on the grant application and whether the items were part of an overall plan. Ms. Strang noted that this is Phase 4 of the project; Pinal County has received three prior grants.
5. Oro Valley – Steam Pump Ranch/Pusch Ranch House. The application scored 86 points. The grant request is for \$150,000, however the Staff recommendation is \$111,160. Some of the requested scope items are ineligible. Ms. Bariola asked whether the property was already on the National Register, or are in the process of preparing their nomination. Mr. Collins said the property is not currently on the National Register, and SHPO has advised Oro Valley that it is an eligible property. Oro Valley has not submitted NRN paperwork to begin the process as of yet. Ms. Bariola asked what the next step would be to begin the process. Mr. Collins noted that Oro Valley has begun a search for an architect who can prepare the nomination. SHPO is assisting with some of the information that

will be necessary for the nomination paperwork. Ms. Bariola asked whether Oro Valley is eligible for a grant, even though the paperwork is not submitted. Mr. Collins said that because they were determined eligible to be on the National Register, they are eligible for a grant.

Ms. Tesser asked whether the applicant has been notified of the ineligible scope items. Ms. Strang replied that she had contacted all fourteen applicants. Mr. Linoff asked whether the applicant would have received additional points for beginning the National Register Nomination process; Mr. Collins replied that they would have received 3 extra points. Chair Thorne asked about the intended use of the property. Ms. Strang noted that the Pusch Ranch House is one component of the Steam Pump Ranch. The entire complex is intended to be an educational opportunity for Oro Valley, and for tourism. SHPO will review the plans for the entire property to ensure that the Secretary of Interior standards are met. Mr. Collins noted that the SHPO has a copy of the master plan, and he gave some further information on historic preservation efforts in Oro Valley. Ms. Bariola asked if anyone from Oro Valley were available to represent the application. Informed there was no one, Ms. Bariola went on to note that, while the application scored successfully enough to obtain a grant, the applicant will more successful in future grants by making a close read of the application process information. Further discussion ensued, regarding the National Register Nomination process for Oro Valley, which was not begun until after the grant application was submitted.

6. Yavapai County – Citizen’s Cemetery Fence. The application scored 84 points. The grant request is \$54,801, which is also the Staff recommendation. Chair Thorne noted that the application lists the fence is partly to mitigate vandalism, theft and neglect to the cemetery. He asks if the applicant is undertaking other measures to ensure the security of the property. Ms. Strang noted that the fence is likely a first step. The cemetery is open to trespass at the moment, though it is no longer active at this point; it is a historic point. The cemetery association works hard to maintain the cemetery. Chair Thorne is hoping that the fence will not be a “band-aid”. Ms. Strang said that the Citizen’s Cemetery is in the same situation as the Pioneer Cemeteries in Phoenix, which has a successful fence in place.

Ms. Strang said that those are the six applications recommended for funding. Following are the applications not recommended for funding. Ms. Nesser addressed the public to note that the grant rating team does not evaluate individual projects, but rather evaluates the grant application and how it addresses the criteria. Workshop attendance is critical. Ms. Bariola concurred with Ms. Nesser about the importance of the workshop.

7. Arizona Department of Health Services – Arizona State Hospital Administration Building. Ms. Strang noted that the application was for a Historic Building Preservation Plan and National Register Nomination. The building is a 1912 edifice designed by Mahoney. The request was for \$29,940. Chair Thorne asked that those who filled out speaker’s request forms step up to speak. Philip Blair began by thanking the HPAC for their work in historic preservation. He continued by outlining the importance of the hospital building and the hospital complex to the Van Buren St. community. The project would also have been important to the City of Phoenix as well, for its Arizona Centennial connection. Mr. Nucci spoke to Mr. Blair about making the case for community benefits, and a lack of matching funds. He noted that making a

more compelling case for community benefit would have made a difference. Mr. Blair noted that he feels that the matching funds are actually available. He also responded that the community benefit is there, especially in relation to the location of the building. Mr. Linoff noted that the security arrangements for the State Hospital would impinge on public access, and asked Mr. Blair how those arrangements would be modified while still maintaining the security necessary. Mr. Blair noted that the Administration Building is the first building on the property, and sits slightly separate from the necessarily secured portion of the hospital.

Mr. Chris Ibarra spoke next. He was part of the hospital employee/community team that worked on developing the grant application. He noted that the public benefit would accrue not only to the general public, but the hospital community as well, including patients. Revitalizing the building will also be important to that community.

Ms. Patrice Caldwell addressed HPAC to note that the matching funds are available, in spite of the current budget crunch in the state. Ms. Caldwell's budget for the project was \$25,000, which she, in good intent as to stewardship of the budget, did not include as matching funds. She acknowledged responsibility for misunderstanding that portion of the application. She asked HPAC to consider funding the project "below-the-line". The HBPP will allow for a plan to rehabilitate the Administrative Building in time for the Arizona Centennial. Mr. Linoff thanked Ms. Caldwell for her comments. He noted that there are more applications than funds available to disburse. He suggested that Ms. Caldwell reapply for the second cycle of FY2008, and work with Staff to assist in preparing a new application. Ms. Bariola agreed. Ms. Nesser also suggested Ms. Caldwell work with Mr. Collins of SHPO as well. Mr. Nucci noted that the application did score well, for a first time applicant, except for the two areas of matching funds and community benefit.

8. City of Phoenix – Steel Indian School Dining Hall. The application scored 70 points. The grant request was for \$150,000. Barbara Stocklin, the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Officer spoke on the application. She noted that the Steel Indian School is both listed on the National Register and as a City Historic Landmark. It is a nationally significant building located in a beautiful park in Central Phoenix. The Indian School complex has received grant applications in the past. She noted that the public planning for this complex has not changed since the last Heritage Fund grant the city received. There are timing issues involving bond issue funds as well. She asked that HPAC consider funding this project, as the building will be negatively affected without Heritage Fund monies. She noted that although there have been administrative compliance issues, all projects have been completed, so she feels the zero score was not warranted. Chris Ewell of Phoenix Parks and Recreation noted the level of community support was reflected in the Proposition A ballot initiative, which listed Steel Indian School Park as a beneficiary of the proposition funds.

Ms. Nesser noted that funding this project would mean reallocating funds from applications that scored higher during this cycle. Ms. Stocklin noted that she did not suggest taking money from anyone else. She feels that the SHPO set-aside and ASP set-aside are available, as well as second cycle funds, which would allow the Steel Indian School project to be funded. Catherine "Rusty" Foley, the immediate past chair of the Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission, spoke

next. She noted that there have been significant private-sector partnerships in the projects related to the Indian School complex. Chair Thorne noted that each application this cycle represents a worthy project. The grant application is designed to remove personal preferences from the review process, and the project is not rated. The application, which should explain the project in objective terms with documentation for each assertion, is the sole criteria for raters to decide on a score. The process has become more competitive of late, because of budget concerns. This means that reallocating resources is not as flexible an option as it may have been in the past. Mr. Nucci suggested posting on the ASP website successful applications to assist applicants in determining how best to document the public benefit and public participation sections.

9. Pima County – Curley School. The application scored 64 points. The grant request was \$150,000. There was no public comment.
10. Town of Snowflake – Snowflake Academy. The application scored 62 point. The grant request was \$60,000. There was no public comment.

Ms. Strang went on to discuss the FY2008 first cycle financial information. The ASP strategic plan states that 75% of projects must score 80 points or above. The six applications that scored more than 80 points represent 75% of the projects. There are two applications that could be funded if there were dollars available to do so, however there are not. Chair Thorne clarified that if the funds were available, the first eight projects could be funded. Ms. Strang discussed the total revenue for the HP grant program, which was \$1,197,917, of which 2/3 was allocated for the FY2008 first cycle. Those funds amount to \$798,611. The recommended awards for the first cycle add to \$542,293. The SHPO set-aside is \$100,000, and the set-aside for ASP Development is \$150,000, for a total \$792,293, leaving a balance of \$6,318. That allows a carry-over balance of \$405,624 for the FY2008 second cycle. There may be funds that close with remaining revenue to carry-over, which may affect the total available revenue for the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle.

Mr. Linoff asked when the allocation to purchase the Picket Post House would come out of the budget. Ms. Strang said that \$700,000, as well as \$131,000 carry-over had already been moved from the HP grant fund to ASP. The total “off the top” was \$831,000. Mr. Nucci asked why ASP would be asking for a set-aside of \$150,000 when, after detailed discussion with Executive Staff, HPAC did not recommend making that set-aside available separately. His understanding was that the \$700,000 would include that \$150,000 set-aside. Mr. Nucci would propose a slightly different motion than the Staff recommended motion in the agenda packet. Further discussion on the set-aside followed.

Chair Thorne asked about the projected budgets for HP grants for the next three years. Ms. Pulsifer said that each year, the Heritage Fund allocates funds, and if the Heritage Fund is fully funded, the HP grant program receives the same amount every year. The requested set-asides for SHPO and ASP Development are the same amount every year as well. The amount of deobligated funds will not be available until the end of the year. Chair Thorne noted that Mr. Nucci and Ms. Ryall both noted that Assistant Director Ream had agreed to “skipping” the set-aside for the next two years, and the Chair would like to discuss that further. Ms. Bariola said that, following discussion, HPAC had moved that the set-aside not be given separately, but rather as part of the \$700,000 total. Because only the ASP Board can accept or reject actions made by advisory committees, this recommendation was not set in stone, and the ASP Board did not elect

to discontinue the separate set aside, following Executive Session at the Board meeting. Mr. Nucci noted that the recommendation today should express the wishes of HPAC as far as funding the Picket Post House purchase, as the current budget will seriously curtail the work of the HP grant program.

Ms. Pulsifer said that in the agenda packet for this meeting there are lists of both the SHPO projects using their set-aside, and the ASP Development projects using that set-aside. The HPAC recommendation going to the Board for their September meeting would normally be aligned with what is in the agenda packet. HPAC can make a different recommendation if they choose, but any recommendation should be based on a reflection on all of the information presented. Ms. Bariola noted that the ASP Development funds would go to deserving ASP Historic Parks for their maintenance/renovation/repair. Mr. Nucci recalled that AD Ream had assured HPAC at their previous meeting that no Historical Parks would be at risk as a result of "skipping" the set-aside. Further discussion followed.

Mr. Linoff noted that when the HP grant fund was created, the set-asides were not originally intended solely for SHPO/ASP Development. He agrees that Mr. Nucci is correct in making a clear statement to the ASP Board that HPAC feels constrained without adequate funding. Ms. Pulsifer noted that if HPAC makes a motion different from the Staff recommendation motion listed in the agenda packet, it is important that HPAC send a representative or representatives to the ASP Board meeting to support whatever motion they forward. Mr. Linoff agreed. Chair Thorne called for a motion.

Mr. Nucci suggested that the strategic plan be amended to allow for more applications to be approved. Ms. Strang said that the two projects that fell below the plan line during this cycle could not be funded due to lack of funds. Mr. Collins noted that the strategic plan line says that 75% must meet the strategic plan. If there are funds available, HPAC is able to fund more than 75% if they wish. Mr. Nucci would like to see an agenda item on the strategic plan at the next meeting. Further discussion of the finances followed.

Mr. Nucci moved that, whereas the Historic Preservation Grant Program remains the single source for brick-and-mortar preservation and conservation of historic resources in the state of Arizona today, the six highest scoring Historic Preservation grant applications be recommended for funding for the FY2008 first cycle Historic Preservation Grant Program in the amount of \$584,293, and further recommend approval of the \$100,000 set aside for the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and do not recommend approval of the \$150,000 set aside for Arizona State Parks Development, instead retaining those funds for the FY2008 second cycle Historic Preservation Grant Program, and further move that this recommendation be forwarded to the Arizona State Parks Board for final action, along with a delegated representative of HPAC to attend the meeting in support of the recommendation. Mr. Linoff seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

Chair Thorne moved on to discuss HPAC representation at the ASP Board meeting. Ms. Ryall asked for an eMail notification of the Board meeting date, time and location, which Ms. Pulsifer will provide when the information is available. Mr. Linoff noted that the Chair's attendance at the meeting would add extra weight.

Chair Thorne recognized Ms. Moloff, who spoke on the importance of HPAC's work in historic preservation in Arizona. She recognized the effort HPAC puts into the work of the grant program.

## **D. REPORTS**

### **1. Parks Board Actions on HPAC Items**

Ms. Pulsifer said that the ASP Board had considered two items from HPAC at their most recent meeting. The Arizona Preservation Foundation Montgomery House one-year extension was approved, and Mr. Linoff was appointed to HPAC to complete a term ending December 31, 2010.

### **2. Heritage Fund Liaison Report**

Ms. Bariola said that she enjoyed serving as the grant rating team liaison from HPAC. She appreciated the opportunity to read the applications, with the exception of the Pinal County application because of her association with the Town of Florence. She did feel that the workshops provide invaluable information to applicants, but there were applications that were lacking some indication that the information had been absorbed. Mr. Nucci noted that the administrative compliance points count for 10 points, as well as the matching funds counting for 10 points. Applicants that lack in both areas are beginning their score at 80 points. He asked Ms. Bariola if she had reviewed the applications from Safford and Tucson, and found them ineligible during the review process. Ms. Bariola said that was the case. The Old Safford Theater should have had documents submitted to reflect the third-party status of the application. Ms. Strang said that the Santa Cruz Catholic Church was deemed ineligible because of a prior application for the same project. Mr. Nucci asked where the rating team draws the line between an incomplete application and a poor score. He then asked Ms. Strang why ASU withdrew their applications. Ms. Strang said they would resubmit their applications for the second cycle, and would submit a more robust narrative.

### **3. Heritage Fund Report**

The disbursement has not yet arrived. There will be a full report at the next meeting, and Ms. Pulsifer will eMail HPAC with the information when it becomes available.

### **4. Grant Staff Update**

Ms. Strang attended the Historic Preservation Conference and put together a short brochure regarding the Governor's Historic Preservation Honor Awards. A significant number of the awards reflect HP grants given over the years. Ms. Strang noted that among three projects that had scored particularly well, the Curley School project won the Governor's Grand Honor Award this year. Mr. Linoff suggested that, for the next Conference, HPAC be nominated for an award for the biannual grant cycle. Chair Thorne agreed.

### **5. SHPO**

#### **A. Staff Update**

Mr. Collins noted that Bob Frankenburger, SHPO architect, has returned to the office after an absence. Kathryn Leonard, National Register Coordinator, is on maternity leave. A former SHPO staff member is contracted to fill the position in Ms. Leonard's absence.

#### **B. National Register Nominations – None at this time.**

## **E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

None.

**G. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE,  
REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

Mr. Linoff suggested that the report to the ASP Board for their September meeting be forwarded to HPAC, including the language of the motion made today. Chair Thorne requested an item regarding nominations at the next Conference.

**H. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

October 20, 2008, Boyce Thompson Arboretum State Park  
Arizona State Parks Board meeting – September 19, 2008, Peoria City Council Chambers (to be confirmed). Ms. Pulsifer noted that AD Ream has added this meeting date to his calendar.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Thorne adjourned the meeting at 12:37pm.